DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 984 HE 023 089

AUTHOR Raphael, Lawrence W.
TITLE Leadership and Excellence in Christian Theological Seminaries. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Atlanta, GA, November 2-5, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Church Related Colleges; College Faculty; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Leadership Qualities; Religious Education; Staff Role; Supervisory Methods; *Theological Education
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Chief Executive Officers

ABSTRACT

The investigation analyzed survey results from 18 Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and about 500 faculty and staff of accredited Protestant and Roman Catholic theological seminaries. The two research hypotheses were: (1) there is a relationship between leadership match and internal measures of organizational effectiveness as represented by the scores on the instrument used and (2) there is a relationship between leadership match and the external measures of ranked institutional quality. Characteristics of the schools that were examined were: school type; school sex; CEO years of service; school enrollment trends; and school size. There was also an in-depth examination of nine effectiveness dimensions and jury ranking. After an evaluation of the different scores of each seminary in different effectiveness dimensions, a visual profile emerged and the arrangements of seminaries in clusters of effectiveness dimensions was possible: elite, mediocre, and external oriented. Results indicated: there is a significant relationship between internal and external measures of effectiveness and physical attributes of the particular seminary; seminaries that do well in externally oriented areas have low effectiveness scores on morale and internal process effectiveness and in academic areas; and the total impact of leadership as measured by this study does not emerge as being as important as other qualities and characteristics (e.g. strong faculties, growing endowments, and coeducational). Contains 5 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313984

LEADERSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

a working paper presented at the

Association for the Study of Higher Education
November 5, 1989
Atlanta, Georgia

prepared by Lawrence W. Raphael

New York University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 023 089

ASHE
ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Ritz-Carlton, Buckhead in Atlanta, Georgia, November 2-5, 1989. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

LEADERSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

Introduction

My paper is taken from the draft of my not yet completed doctoral dissertation at New York University. This study has a working title, which is "Leadership and Excellence in Christian Theological Seminaries." The research is an investigation of leadership in a higher education population that has not been studied before: Chief Executive Officers, together with the faculty and staff, of theological seminaries in the United States.

While there have been a number of recent studies conducted of college and university presidents, none of these studies has separately analyzed data of theological seminary presidents. There exists no published or dissertation research which has been carried out on chief executive officers of the specialized educational institutions investigated here.

Theological seminaries represent a discrete and influential population. Their faculties, student-bodies, and alumni frequently attain positions of leadership within their own religious communities as well as in the larger society. In a 1987 survey of enrollment, it was noted that 56,000 students were then enrolled in the 197 accredited seminaries (Fact Book, 1987).

My study is an investigation of a selected number of these accredited Protestant and Roman Catholic schools. The four major degree-granting Jewish seminaries were excluded because the population of interest in the research was composed of only accredited Christian seminaries in America.

Methodology

The first methodological step in my study was to develop a measure of external effectiveness, establishing one of the variables in my research. I invited a jury of ten experts to rate each of the 93 accredited seminaries with an enrollment of at least 150 students on the basis of their perceived excellence. Each jury member had at least ten years of experience in the field of seminary education and was selected on the basis of both his knowledge of the field and willingness to assist in this study. The jury member was asked to rate each seminary's effectiveness by completing an evaluation form.

After the rating was completed, each school received a ranking and the next step of the research design was to divide the population into two samples, maximally differentiated on the basis of rated effectiveness. Two groups of 20 were selected from those ranked -- the total of 40 were ranked one to twenty (high-ranked) and seventy-four to ninety-three (low-ranked).

The next step of my research was to survey the CEOs of these 40 theological seminaries. This was done in order to investigate the relationships among chief executive officers, the senior administrative staff and faculty, and subsequently the effectiveness of the particular seminary. The CEOs completed a biographical questionnaire, which was previously developed by Katherine Moore (1983), and a test on leadership style and subordinate maturity, designed by Hersey and Blanchard (1982).

In all those seminaries where the CEO returned the completed material, I then sent a questionnaire to all full-time faculty and senior administrative staff. This questionnaire was adapted from Cameron's (1978) Assessment of Organizational Structure and Effectiveness, developed to measure the internal perceptions of institutional effectiveness by these respondents.

In 11 of the 20 high-ranked seminaries the CEO and more than 50% of the possible respondents returned their questionnaires. Responses from 17 of the 20 CEOs in the 20 low-ranked seminaries were received, and in each case there was a 50% or better return from the faculty and staff. I therefore had a population of 28 seminaries to analyze my data from.

Not surprisingly the decision of the CEO to participate in the survey was critical to the response rate from the faculty and staff. Not every CEO that responded completed all the enclosed questionnaires. Two of the CEOs did not complete the

leadership survey, and one did not complete the biographical information. In the end I had 18 CEOs where the full amount of leadership data was received and returns of the Effectiveness Questionnaire from almost 500 faculty and staff.

Leadership

This research utilized a "situational" approach to the study of leadership. The central concept is that the interaction of a particular leadership style with a specific environment results in a degree of leader effectiveness or ineffectiveness.

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1982), different kinds of leader behavior are appropriate (effective) given different levels of follower maturity. The four possibilities are selling, telling, participating and delegating. The authors claim that their model is distinctive because it does not depict a single ideal behavior style that is suggested as always appropriate only in certain situations.

In basically crisis-oriented organizations, there is considerable evidence that the most appropriate style would be high task and low relationship (telling), since under emergency conditions success often depends on immediate responses to orders. For educational administrators who are presumably working with experienced faculty, the low relationship/low task style (delegating) characterized by a decentralized organization structure and a delegation of

responsibility to individuals may be more effective. Ideally in the Hersey and Blanchard description the leader's style matches correctly with the maturity of the subordinate, leading to a positive leadership match.

Internal Effectiveness

The instrument developed by Cameron claims that it is possible to develop an internal measure of the effectiveness of colleges and universities and to assess their differences. There are nine effectiveness dimensions used by Cameron. These nine dimensions are clustered into four separate groupings:

(1) An externally oriented group of effectiveness dimensions comprising

   a. Student Career Development
   b. System Openness and Community Interaction

(2) A morale oriented group of dimensions comprising:

   a. Student Educational Satisfaction
   b. Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction
   c. Organizational Health

(3) A group of dimensions with an academic orientation comprising:

   a. Student Academic Development
   b. Professional Development
   c. Ability to Acquire Resources

(4) A nontraditional emphasis dimension comprising:

   Student Personal Development

Five resulting groupings of institutions are made based on their standardized mean scores across the nine effectiveness dimensions.

Personal Interviews

The final methodological step was to conduct personal interviews with CEOs at six seminaries. The primary purpose of these interviews was to help validate the data collected through the questionnaires. In addition, these interviews helped enrich the data and enabled the researcher to study the fit between the personal characteristics of CEOs, their leadership style, and institutional function and characteristics.

Description of the Sample

The sample of 28 seminaries, their CEOs and 497 total respondents can be characterized as follows:

a) Leadership Style -- 12 CEOs are telling and 12 are participating

b) School Type -- 14 seminaries are mainline Protestant and 14 are either evangelical or Roman Catholic

c) School Sex -- 22 seminaries are coeducational and six are single sex

d) School Enrollment (trends during the past 10 years) -- 12 seminaries increased over 25%, eight increased less

than 25%, seven decreased less than 25% and one decreased more than 25%

e) School Size -- 15 seminaries have an enrollment between 150-250 students and 13 have an enrollment of more than 250 students

f) Gender of Respondents -- 396 males and 101 females

g) Status of Total Respondents -- 150 are administrative staff, 176 are full professors, 70 are associate professors, 73 are assistant professors and 28 are CEOs

The additional biographical data that were collected are of interest in comparison to CEOs of other colleges and universities. Seminary CEOs who responded to the questionnaires were equally divided between those with tenure and those without tenure; 70% had received doctorates; 35% had already served more than seven years in office as CEO of their institutions; 80% held academic appointments; all but one are white; all are male; the median age is 55; of those not in a religious order, all but one are married; 70% of those married have working spouses; and in almost all instances they have far exceeded the educational attainment level of their parents.

Hypotheses

There were two research hypotheses tested in this research.

Hypothesis One: There is a relationship between leadership match and the internal measures of organizational effectiveness as represented by the scores on the instrument developed by Cameron.

Table 1 (See Appendix) presents the results of separate f-tests and a Hotelling's T^2-test which compared mean scores on the combined effectiveness measures and between matched and unmatched leadership. For those seminaries where the CEO had a positive leadership match (five schools) there were 86 respondents; for those seminaries where the CEO had a negative leadership match (13 schools) there were 238 respondents. Because the Hotelling's T^2-test is significant ($p<.001$) hypothesis one is supported. With the exception of two variables, Student Personal Development (dimension #4) and Organizational Health (dimension #9), all measures contributed to a difference between the matched and unmatched groups.

Further analysis by way of separate t-tests (See Table 2 in Appendix) indicates that, with respect to individual measures, a positive leadership match appears to relate to greater effectiveness in Student Academic Satisfaction (#2), Professional Development and Quality of Faculty (#6), System Openness and Community Interaction (#7) and Ability to Acquire Resources (#8); and to lowered effectiveness in Student

Educational Satisfaction (#1), Student Career Development (#3) and Faculty and Administrator Satisfaction (#5).

As a total group, the various t-tests illustrate that the dimensions related to student life and development are more affected by leadership match than those that are concerned with faculty or institutional matters.

Hypothesis Two: There is a relationship between leadership match and the external measures of ranked institutional quality.

In order to test the relationship between the jury ranking (which was the external measure of institutional quality, or effectiveness), and leadership match condition, a Fisher's Exact test was used. It was to be expected that all high-ranked seminaries would have a positive leadership match, and low-ranked ones would not. Jury ratings were dichotomized (using the mean scores) in terms of high and low quality on the basis of the juror scores. (See Table 3 in Appendix.)

According to this test the second hypothesis is not supported ($p > 0.43$). However, it is worth noting that close to 75% of the CEOs representing no match between leadership style and subordinate maturity (no match condition), were in the low-ranked seminaries. True, while there is no statistical significance, perhaps because of the small sample size here, there is a trend suggesting that low jury rating

appears to be associated with an absence of match between leadership style and subordinate maturity.

When seminary leaders are unable, or unwilling, to match their leadership styles to subordinate maturity levels, the effectiveness of an institution may be perceived to be low, at least as appraised by experts in the field.

Ancillary Analysis

The two research hypotheses tested at the beginning of this chapter focused on the critical factor of leadership match. Therefore, the tests were conducted primarily utilizing the responses from the 18 CEOs who were part of the 28 seminaries in this study. In order to investigate the seminaries and all the [redacted] faculty and administrative staff who completed and returned the questionnaires, it was decided to include the more than 450 faculty and staff responses and tabulate them in the total of each of their respective seminaries. These ancillary analyses, utilizing the full-time faculty and senior administrative staff, number frequently as many as 498, with some cases as few as 325, depending upon how many questions the respondents answered.

This expanded set of data is used in these ancillary analyses to examine the following characteristics of the five school: school type (mainline Protestant, Evangelical or Roman Catholic); school sex (coeducational or single sex); CEO years of service; school enrollment trends (over the past ten

years); and school size; as well as a more in-depth examination of the nine effectiveness dimensions and jury ranking.

Bivariate relationships between variables are examined using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Multivariate relationships are examined using regression analyses. A summary of the Pearson Correlation Coefficients is presented in Table 4. (See Appendix.)

In commenting briefly on these results, it is possible to note that Leadership Match relates positively to Leadership Style ($r=.43$, $p<.001$), indicating that the match condition is associated with a participating leadership style, while the no-match condition is more likely to be associated with a telling style. Leadership Match is associated negatively to CEO Years ($r=-.64$, $p<001$), indicating that the CEO is more likely to be serving less than seven years when there is a match.

There are many more conclusions that can be drawn from the Pearson Correlation Coefficients but time is limited in this presentation. I will briefly note that these ancillary analyses indicated significant relationships between internal and external measures of effectiveness and physical attributes of the particular seminary (Type, Sex, CEO Years of Service, Enrollment and Size). Relatively strong associations were found to exist between many pairs of the variables studied. Moreover, multiple regression analyses indicated that strong

relationships exist when jury ranking, dimensions #6 (Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty) and dimension #8 (Ability to Acquire Resources) are considered as dependent variables.

Discussion

After an evaluation of the different scores of each seminary in the different effectiveness dimensions, a visual profile emerged and the arrangements of seminaries in clusters of effectiveness dimensions was possible. The labels and definitions of these clusters follows Cameron's usage.

It is important to note that the placement of seminaries into the clusters was based on their scores as compared to each other and not to any other population studied in other research. The total sample of twenty-eight seminaries yielded scores which could be easily grouped into clusters with the labels Elite (high and Low Morale), Mediocre (High and Low Morale) and External Oriented. (See Table 5 in Appendix.)

The procedure established by Cameron shows that meaningful groupings of effectiveness dimensions can be identified where significant differences exist among the institutional clusters. For example, the "Elite High-Morale Group" consists of schools where scores are uniformly higher than the other clusters on the three morale dimensions.

The stereotypical image of an elite-high morale institution in Cameron's study would be a prestigious Ivy League school.

Such a stereotype might be misleading in the population of seminaries under study here, however, seven of the eight "elite" schools are integrated into or associated with selective universities.

In this study all the seminaries judged to be "elite morale" were part of the top twenty in the jury ranking, have a mixed record of enrollment during the past ten years and six of the eight are mainline Protestant (one Roman Catholic and one evangelical).

The "mediocre group" is composed primarily of institutions which are at or slightly below the mean on the nine effectiveness dimensions. The fifteen seminaries in the mediocre clusters are mixed in their affiliation with five mainline, seven evangelical and three Roman Catholic institutions. More than any other cluster they have a higher proportion of increased enrollment over the past ten years. Fourteen of the fifteen seminaries in the two mediocre clusters are in the bottom twenty of the jury ranking.

The "externally oriented group" scores higher than all other groups on the two externally oriented dimensions (Student Career Development, and System Openness and Community Interaction). These schools are the most effective in areas dealing with adaptation to external environmental contingencies, emphasis on meeting community needs, and in preparing students to successfully obtain jobs outside the institution.

The five seminaries in this cluster are independent of any university, fall in the bottom twenty of jury ranking (except for one in the top), are either mainline Protestant (three) or Roman Catholic (two) and have a mixed picture of enrollment trends during the past ten years.

The analyses conducted for this study have gone a step further than Cameron by relating the effectiveness categories to categories of institutions in such a way that significant differences among the seminary clusters and the effectiveness categories are shown. If a seminary displays high effectiveness in professional development and faculty quality, for example, it is predicted by these results that the seminary will also do well in student academic development and ability to acquire resources. Effectiveness in external oriented areas, however, would probably be low.

The results of the Pearson Correlation Coefficients indicate that high faculty quality is more likely to be present at larger seminaries and ones with a greater ability to acquire financial and personnel resources.

Viewing the data from the Cameron effectiveness dimensions in a reverse manner, it may be possible to say that seminaries succeeding in external organizational transactions likely would not do well in academic and morale effectiveness. Similarly, seminaries that do well in one morale dimensions (e.g., faculty satisfaction) are likely to do well in all the morale dimensions. These clustering results have made it

possible, in other words, to make predictions both about certain individual effectiveness dimension scores (based on the effectiveness dimensions clusters) and about general domains of effectiveness as well (based on the institutional clusters).

These associations also can be seen in the results of the Correlation Coefficients and the regression analysis. There is a series of significant relationships between internal and external measures of effectiveness and physical attributes of the particular seminary. Moreover, strong relationships exist when jury ranking and the dimensions of Professional Development and Quality of Faculty and Ability to Acquire Resources are considered together.

Another implication of these findings relates to the ability of organizations to be highly effective in all effectiveness domains. Seminaries that do well in externally oriented areas, for example, were found to have low effectiveness scores on morale and internal process effectiveness and in academic areas.

This study differs with Cameron on one finding, corroborate some major findings and demonstrates another. First, Cameron has shown that dynamic, growing institutions will have different effectiveness profiles than static or stagnant institutions. The research completed here, albeit on many fewer schools, shows no such results.

Second, Cameron makes the additional claim that the ability to acquire resources is the most powerful variable in explaining variance across dimensions. The examination of the twenty-eight seminaries in this sample reinforces this observation. The four seminaries that do the best job of acquiring resources also possess scores high enough in the other dimensions to be part of the "elite" schools. The regression analysis indicates that there is a strong relationship between the dimension, Ability to Acquire Resources and large, mainline Protestant seminaries.

Astin (1985) claims that an institution's financial resources have no impact on student academic development. Cameron's research shows that the indicators of organizational wealth are the most important factors in explaining academic effectiveness. The data collected for this study supports Astin more than it does Cameron. While it is true that organizational wealth is important, there is no particular relationship with student academic development and the dimension of ability to acquire resources.

A third implication of these cluster determinations shows the close association with the results of jury ranking. It is not surprising that seminaries that perceive themselves as possessing quality students, faculty and resources are also perceived by others in the field as possessing these same qualities.

The jury ranking, used as the external measure of effectiveness, helped focus the question of what determines perceived quality by external evaluators. The evaluation form utilized by the jurors asked them to determine a seminary's perceived excellence on the basis of: accessibility and quality of faculty; curricula; instructional facilities; quality of students; and the performance of the graduates.

As noted previously, the two measures of effectiveness (external and internal) are extremely close in their determination of which seminaries are regarded at the top. The regression analysis indicates that jury rank is most affected by School Size, School Type and School Sex. That is mainline Protestant and coeducational schools, not necessarily large ones are important influences of juror ratings.

Hersey and Blanchard, predicted that the dominant style of leadership in a university setting would be delegating. In fact, in this research none of the CEOs surveyed fit this style. Of the 28 respondents, 14 were typed as telling and 14 as participating.

The Hersey and Blanchard prediction is based upon the assumption that most CEOs are working with a relatively mature staff and faculty. This typical collegial atmosphere is one that encourages delegating from the top with staff and faculty interested and capable of assuming a great deal of responsibility. There is no empirical data collected of

college CEOs, however, that would support or reject the assertion by Hersey and Blanchard.

The population studied in this research clearly differs from that prediction. The difference cuts across the different categories created in this study. There are no delegating CEOs in the "top" or "bottom," in the mainline or evangelical, or even in the elite or non-traditional seminaries.

The self-professed leadership style expressed in the personal interviews was quite different. In the face-to-face meetings with the CEOs (with the exception of a Roman Catholic Rector) they all claimed to typically follow a delegating leadership style. This discrepancy, I believe, is the result of the personal presentations of the CEOs. The results of the completed questionnaires show how different is the self-perception and the reality. When answering an interviewer's questions it may sound good to select delegating as a preferred style; when completing the leadership questionnaire telling and participating emerge as the preferred choice.

The reasons for the difference with seminary CEOs and the predicted results of Hersey and Blanchard may be a result of some of the differences between seminaries and colleges or universities. The first difference is the homogeneity among first the student-body and second the faculty. With only a five percent Black faculty (Fact Book, 1987) the seminary community typically is one that shares a pre-determined common

background and common set of beliefs to a much greater extent than a usual college student-body or faculty.

The second set of differences has been noted earlier: the average size of the student body is quite small, with very few seminaries in this study having a population of more than 250 students (making them smaller than even most liberal arts colleges); the size of the faculty being small enough to compare it to a modest-sized college academic department; and the average tenure of both faculty and CEOs being longer than their secular college equivalents.

These differences might suggest an almost familial atmosphere where the delegation of authority by the seminary CEO might be the expected behavior. It appears that the reality of the situation is different. The seminary is highly structured, in spite of its modest size. The seminary faculty may frequently be more interested in its teaching, its academic discipline, or the larger religious community discussion, than sharing in the seminary decision-making.

The CEO is often deeply involved in the religious and academic life of the seminary and the religious movement the seminary is part of, and therefore is unlikely to give up as much authority and responsibility as their counter-part in general higher education.

Not surprisingly, the seminaries with strong faculties, growing endowments, coeducational and large and increasing enrollments are viewed by the external experts as the most

effective. The total impact of leadership, at least as measured by the test conducted in this research, does not emerge as important as these other qualities and characteristics.

There remains much that should be done with the discrete higher education population and I hope my initial research will only be the beginning of a larger focus on leadership and excellence in seminary education.

APPENDICES

Table 1

Relationship between Leadership Match and Effectiveness on Nine Dimensions

DIMENSION	Univariate T-tests D.F. (1,318) T	Significance
#1 Student Educational Satisfaction	5.79	.017
#2 Student Academic Development	14.72	.000
#3 Student Career Development	6.40	.012
#4 Student Personal Development	.00	.972
#5 Faculty & Administrator Employment Satisfaction	13.88	.000
#6 Prof. Development & Quality of Faculty	26.73	.000
#7 System Openness & Community Interaction	6.78	.010
#8 Ability to Acquire Resources	5.36	.021
#9 Organizational Health	.00	.948

Hotelling's T^2, Multivariate Two Sample Test

Hotelling's $T^2_{(9,318)}$ $P<.001$

$R^2 = 1-\hat{} = 1-.72 = 28\%$

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations per Variable

	(Group 1) Pos. Match (N=86)		(Group 2) Neg. Match (N=238)			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
#1 St. Ed. Satisfaction	3.86	0.57	4.05	0.67	-2.47	0.022
#2 St. Acad. Development	4.46	0.57	4.15	0.69	4.18	0.000
#3 St. Career Development	5.53	0.76	5.78	0.75	-2.56	0.010
#4 St. Personal Development	4.47	0.68	4.47	0.64	-0.05	0.957
#5 Faculty & Admin. Employ. Satisfaction	4.16	0.68	4.44	0.55	-3.45	0.001
#6 Prof. Develop. & Quality of Faculty	5.28	0.82	4.61	1.10	5.90	0.000
#7 System Openness & Community Interaction	4.90	0.91	4.60	0.97	2.50	0.013
#8 Ability to Acquire Resources	4.38	0.94	4.72	1.26	-2.64	0.009
#9 Organizat'l Health	3.35	0.64	3.34	0.69	0.05	0.956

Table 3

Relationship between External Measure of Quality (Jury Rank) and Leadership Match Condition

	Count Row Pct. Col Pct	Leadership Match Yes	 No	Row Total
Jury Ranking	High*	2 40.0 40.0	3 60.0 23.1	5 27.8
	Low*	3 23.1 60.0	10 76.9 76.9	13 72.2
	Column Total	5 27.8	13 72.2	18 100.0

Fisher's Exact Test One Tail 0.433

*"High" means juror scores for these (studied) seminaries placed them in the top twenty schools; "low" scores in the bottom twenty.

Table 4
Summary of Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Variable		Correlation Coefficient	N	P
Lead. Match	Lead Style	.43	325	.000
	CEO Years	-.65	325	.000
Lead Style	School Sex	-.35	376	.000
	CEO Years	-.35	376	.000
School Type	School Sex	.46	498	.000
	School Enroll.	-.33	498	.000
	Jury Rank	.46	498	.000
School Sex	School Size	-.33	498	.000
	School Type	.46	498	.000
School Size	Jury Rank	-.65	498	.000
	School Sex	-.33	498	.000
	Dimen. #6 (Prof. Dev.)	.34	497	.000
	Dimen. #8 (Acq. Res.)	.34	498	.000
Jury Rank	Dimen. #6	-.51	497	.000
	Dimen. #8	-.38	497	.000
	School Type	.46	498	.000
	School Size	-.65	498	.000
Dimen. #2 (St. Acd. Dev)	Dimen. #6	.40	497	.000
	Dimen. #7 (Sys. Open.)	.33	497	.000
	Dimen. #8	.43	497	.000
Dimen. #4 (St. Per. Dev)	Dimen. #5 (Empl. Sat.)	.33	497	.000
	Dimen. #7	.44	497	.000
	Dimen. #9 (Org. Hlt.)	-.43	493	.000
Dimen. #5 (Empl. Sat.)	Dimen. #4	.33	497	.000
	Dimen. #9	-.38	493	.000
Dimen. #6 (Prof. Dev.)	School Size	.34	497	.000
	Jury Rank	-.51	498	.000
	Dimen. #2	.40	497	.000
	Dimen. #7	.35	497	.000
	Dimen. #8	.47	497	.000
Dimen. #7 (Sys. Open.)	Dimen. #2	.33	497	.000
	Dimen. #4	.44	497	.000
	Dimen. #6	.35	497	.000
	Dimen. #9	-.34	493	.000
Dimen. #8 (Acq. Res.)	School Size	.34	498	.000
	Jury Rank	-.38	497	.000
	Dimen. #2	.43	497	.000
	Dimen. #6	.47	497	.000
Dimen. #9 (Org. Hlt.)	Dimen. #4	-.43	493	.000
	Dimen. #5	-.38	493	.000

Table 6
Distribution of Seminaries in Effectiveness Clusters

ELITE		
	High Morale	4 seminaries
	Low Morale	4 seminaries
MEDIOCRE		
	High Morale	4 seminaries
	Low Morale	11 seminaries
EXTERNAL ORIENTED		5 seminaries
	Total	28 seminaries

WORKS CITED

Astin, A. (1985). Achieving educational excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cameron, K. (1978). Organizational effectiveness: Its measurement and prediction in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, New Haven.

Fact book on theological education, 1986-87. (1987). Vandalia, OH: Association of Theological Schools.

Hersey and Blanchard. (1982). Management of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Moore, K. (1983). The structure of presidents' and deans' careers. Journal of Higher Education, 54, 500-515.